

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-29 are pending.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 18, 19, 24 and 25 and 29 have been rejected under 35 USC as being unpatentable over the abstract of Japanese Laid-Open Patent Publication No. Hei. 6-178133 (Okimoto) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,196,451 (Pellar). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has maintained this rejection from the previous Action and responded to Applicants assertion that Okimoto only teaches detection of the direction of a paper set on the device for printing and changing the printing screen angle based on that detection when the image is output by asserting that the claims as written recite the detection of "image data" of a "document" and the detection of a screen angle based on this "image data". The Examiner asserts that this recitation does not appear to require any elements that are not found in the detection of the image of a blank page and the detection of a screen angle appropriate to the detected direction of that blank page (as in Okimoto). Applicant is somewhat confused as to the point the Examiner is trying to make, but offers the following explanation of the differences between what is claimed and what is taught in Okimoto.

Claim 1 recites "a detecting unit for detecting a screen angle of the image data." This clearly refers to the image data which has not yet been printed, since a later claimed element refers to the printing unit for reproducing a quasi-half-tone. As is well known in the art, screen angle refers to the angle at which the half-tone screens are placed in relation to one another. This is *not* the same as the direction of the page placed on the printer in Okimoto. The fact is that Okimoto fails to teach or suggest detecting the screen angle of the image data, as claimed. Okimoto is limited to detecting the orientation of the document to be printed and adjusting the screen angle of the output image (by 90° for example). Regardless of whether it does not appear that any additional elements would be required to detect the screen angle of the image data rather than just the orientation of the image, it remains that these are different functions and Okimoto does not perform the function claimed. Thus, Okimoto does not teach or suggest the detecting unit of claim 1.

Pellar does not overcome deficiencies of Okimoto. Accordingly, Okimoto and Pellar do not teach or suggest the image forming apparatus of claim 1 as a whole. Other independent claims 7, 13, 18, 24 and 29 recite the same detecting unit as claim 1 or the corresponding detecting step.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 18, 19, 24 and 25 should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 32577-20120.00.

Dated: March 3, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Deborah S. Gladstein

Registration No.: 43,636  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 760-7753